

Salve Regina University Digital Commons @ Salve Regina

Faculty Assembly Documents

Faculty and Staff

3-2-2007

AS Minutes 2007 03 02

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.salve.edu/fac_assembly

Recommended Citation

"AS Minutes 2007 03 02" (2007). *Faculty Assembly Documents*. Paper 26.
http://digitalcommons.salve.edu/fac_assembly/26

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty and Staff at Digital Commons @ Salve Regina. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Assembly Documents by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ Salve Regina. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@salve.edu.

SALVE REGINA UNIVERSITY FACULTY ASSEMBLY

Minutes of the Meeting of March 2, 2007 Young Building Ballroom

In the absence of Carol Gibbons, John Quinn, Vice-Speaker of the Executive Assembly, presided.

1. **Call to Order and Minutes.** The meeting was called to order at 1:12 p.m. The minutes of the February meeting were approved by Unanimous Consent.
2. **Neuroscience Proposal.** Sr. Lisa Zuccarelli presented proposals for four new courses and a new minor in Neuroscience for the second time. Discussion ensued over why the Faculty Assembly was voting on the new courses, which could be construed as a change best left to the discretion of the department. Others pointed out that the *Protocol* requires that substantive changes are to be discussed and voted on, and that the addition of four courses (three of which contribute to the proposed minor) qualifies as a substantive change.

A motion was made and seconded to recommend the new courses. On a paper ballot, the motion succeeded, 51 votes FOR, 2 votes AGAINST, 2 votes to ABSTAIN.

A motion was made and seconded to recommend the new minor in Neuroscience. On a paper ballot, the motion succeeded, 52 votes FOR, one vote AGAINST, one vote to ABSTAIN.

3. **Treasurer's Report.** Sr. Lisa Zuccarelli as Treasurer reported that 69 faculty have paid their dues. The balance in the Assembly's account is \$2,200.18.
4. **Committee Report: FACSB.** Lois Eveleth reported the results of a meeting held between four members of the FACSB (Lois Eveleth, Carol Gibbons, Sandor Kadar, and John Quinn) and the President on 23 February 2007.

On the matter of salaries, the President indicated that attaining the median of the comparative institutions remains the University's goal.

On the matters of reducing the contract year to nine months, proceeding with a plan for workload reduction, and considering contract hours in workload calculation, Professor Eveleth reported that the President is generally in agreement with the FACSB.

On the matter of increasing the number of sabbaticals, the President is not in agreement with the FACSB, pointing out that the number of applicants is not appreciably greater than the one to two awarded per year.

On the matter of increasing the funds available for Professional Development, the President is generally in agreement with FACSB.

Professor Eveleth also reported on discussion of the list of comparable institutions. Criteria for inclusion of schools on the list are that they be comparable in terms of full-time enrollment (approximately 1,200 to 4,000); that they be tuition-driven; that they be in the Catholic tradition; and that they have comparable endowments. Questions from the floor suggest that these criteria are still a matter of importance to the Faculty Assembly. Professor

Eveleth indicated that the President may ask to address the Faculty Assembly on the importance of maintaining the Catholic tradition as a criterion later in the semester.

5. **Committee Report: Faculty Responsibilities.** Dean de la Motte apologized for the delay in moving forward the committee's recommendation concerning workload, and reiterated that it will be made to the President and the faculty well before the end of the academic year.
6. **Committee Report: Ad hoc Faculty Committee on Evaluation Process for Administrators.** Sr. Diane Tomkinson made an extensive report concerning the progress of this committee. The committee had two three-hour meetings on Monday, December 18 and Tuesday, January 30th. Sister Therese Antone was present at both meetings and Dean De La Motte was at the January 30th meeting. Both meetings were facilitated by Dr. Bonnevie. The Committee has agreed upon a series of "Guiding Principles for Evaluation of Administrators by the Faculty." The full report of this committee is appended to these Minutes.
7. **Announcements: New Members of the Salve Community.** The Vice-Speaker welcomed Michael LoPresti, who arrived seven weeks ago, and Grace Munge, born 26 February 2007, to the Salve Regina University community.
8. **Announcement: Dr. Larry Ludlow.** The Vice-Speaker announced that the Executive Committee is discussing the idea of bringing Dr. Larry Ludlow to campus in the fall. Dr. Ludlow is a nationally-recognized leader in the field of teaching evaluations. His presentation will be scheduled for some time in October.
9. **New Business: Dean of Faculty.** Jay Lacouture, as convener of the *ad hoc* committee on a Dean of Faculty position, reported that the committee has done extensive research concerning similar positions at other institutions. He presented a list of possible qualifications and responsibilities for this position, which is seen as an advocate for the interests of the faculty.

Extensive discussion ensued as to the potential duties and responsibilities of a Dean of Faculty and the extent to which a Dean of Faculty could be effective under the present circumstances. James Garman, citing the need for the committee to have some sort of response from the Faculty Assembly in order to determine whether it should continue working, made the following motion:

That the Faculty Assembly endorses discussion with the administration and the faculty concerning a Dean of Faculty position at Salve Regina University.

The motion was seconded by John McQuilken. With no further discussion, the motion succeeded on a unanimous voice vote, no abstentions recorded.

10. **New Business: Proposal for Designation of Faculty Emeriti.** The Vice-Speaker chaired a discussion of the proposal for designation of faculty *emeriti*, which had been circulated prior to the meeting. Although most spoke in favor of the proposal, several felt strongly that the *emeritus* designation should be for all retiring faculty or for none. In light of the comments, the Executive Committee will reconsider the proposal at its next meeting.

There was no new business from the floor.

On a motion made and duly seconded, the meeting was adjourned at 2:15 p.m.

REPORT OF THE *AD HOC* FACULTY COMMITTEE ON EVALUATION PROCESS OF ADMINISTRATORS

To: Carol Gibbons, Faculty Assembly

From: *Ad hoc* Faculty Committee on Evaluation Process for Administrators

Date: March 2, 2007

Re: Status Report of Committee's work-to-date

Since our last report to the Faculty Assembly in November, the committee has had two three-hour meetings on Monday, December 18 and Tuesday, January 30th. Sister Therese Antone was present at both meetings and Dean De La Motte joined us at the January 30th meeting. Both meetings were facilitated by Dr. Bonnevie.

In our initial meetings in the fall, the committee agreed upon the following "Guiding Principles for Evaluation of Administrators by the Faculty."

- The process is considered fair and part of an established routine.
- The process is developed in collaboration with Senior Administration, those being evaluated and the evaluation team.
- The baseline for what is being evaluated is clearly defined and understood.
- Those being evaluated provide information related to goals/objectives needed to facilitate communication and a basis for evaluation.
- Intent of evaluation is to recognize excellence or to provide specific recommendations for improvement of performance.
- The evaluation needs to be objective, not subjective, to reduce the potential for personal bias -- likes and dislikes.
- The results of the evaluation need to be discussed with those evaluated in a sincere attempt to bring positive resolution to issues identified.
- The method of dissemination of results needs to be carefully designed to provide feedback to all concerned in a manner that respects privacy and is constructive.

In light of these principles, the committee has been working with Dr. Bonnevie and Sister Therese toward creating an integrated process that fosters collaborative dialogue and provides the faculty an opportunity to give constructive input to both the administrator being evaluated and to the administrator's supervisor (i.e. the University President, or in some cases the VPAA) who would be receiving the faculty's assessment. We agreed that a survey-type instrument might be part of such a process but would not be its sole component.

Over the past two meetings, the group has attempted to model what such a process might look like through engaging in dialogue with the new VPAA, Dean de la Motte.

The agenda for our next meeting, scheduled for March 16th, is to design a replicable process that can be presented to the faculty for discussion at Faculty Assembly and eventual action later this spring, for implementation next year.

Respectfully submitted,
Diane Tomkinson, OSF